

ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF DIFFERENTIAL GEOMETRY IN ESTONIA

VIKTOR ABRAMOV

ABSTRACT. We give a brief review of a research made in the field of differential geometry in Estonia in the period from the beginning of the 19th century to the present time. The biographic data of mathematicians who made a valuable contribution to the development of differential geometry in Estonia in mentioned period are presented. The material of the first section covers the period from the beginning of the 19th century to the middle of the 20th century and it can be considered as a brief historical sketch of the development of differential geometry in Estonia in this period. The next sections give an idea of the modern trends of development of differential geometry in Estonia.

The history of research in the field of differential geometry in Estonia is inseparably linked with the history of the University of Tartu. Therefore we begin by reminding some basic facts from the history of the University of Tartu. The University of Tartu was founded by the King Gustav II Adolf of Sweden in 1632. We omit the turbulent period from the foundation of the university to the end of 18th century when the university sometimes was in Tartu, sometimes was forced to move to other towns of Estonia such as Tallinn and Pärnu as a result of agreements between belligerent powers. In 1802 the university was reopened in Tartu as a provincial Baltic university depending upon the local Knighthoods - it was titled Kaiserliche Universität zu Dorpat (also Imperatorskij Derptschij Universitet). A first important landmark in the history of differential geometric research at the University of Tartu goes back to this period, when J. Martin Bartels (1769-1836) became a professor of mathematics at the University of Tartu (1821). Johann Martin Christian Bartels was born in Braunschweig. He studied at the University of Helmstedt and then at the Göttingen University. He took his doctoral degree at the University of Jena with a thesis in the field of variational calculus in 1803. It should be mentioned that Bartels was the first teacher of Gauss in Braunschweig. Before he was invited to occupy a professorship of mathematics at the University of Tartu, Bartels was a professor of mathematics at the University of Kasan (Russia) for twelve years from 1808 to 1820, where one of his students was Nicolai Ivanovitch Lobachevsky future professor of mathematics and rector of the University of Kasan and one of the founders of non-Euclidean geometry. Bartels contributed to the theory of space curves by creating the method now known as the method of moving orthonormal frame. Given a space curve one can define the local trihedron at a point P of this

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 53-03, 01A55, 01A60, 53A07, 53A10, 53A35, 53C07, 53D05, 81R60, 81T13.

Key words and phrases. Minimal surfaces, semiparallel submanifolds, connections on fiber bundles, higher-dimensional and n -codimensional surfaces in Euclidean and non-Euclidean n -space, gauge theories, BRST-symmetries, jet bundles, symmetries of differential equations, non-commutative geometry.

This work was supported by the grant of Estonian Science Foundation No. 4515.

curve, which consists of three orthogonal unit vectors $\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{n}, \mathbf{b}$, where $\mathbf{t}$ is the unit tangent vector, $\mathbf{n}$ is the principal normal vector and $\mathbf{b}$ is the binormal vector. The triple $\{\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{n}, \mathbf{b}\}$ bears the name of Frenet frame at a point of a curve. Bartels studied the rate of change of the trihedron $\{\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{n}, \mathbf{b}\}$, when a point P begins to move to a near point Q along a curve and he was the first to derive the equations expressing the derivatives of the vectors $\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{n}, \mathbf{b}$ in terms of the vectors themselves now known as Frenet-Serret formulae. The formulae obtained by Bartels were published by his disciple C.E. Senff in 1831, which means that they appeared 17 years earlier than the equations published by Frenet and 22 years before Serret published his equations [22]. It should be noted that Bartels used the components of the vectors $\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{n}, \mathbf{b}$ not the vectors themselves because the notion of a vector was actually developed later.

The professorship of applied mathematics was opened in 1843 and Ferdinand Minding (1806–1885) was invited to occupy this position. Ferdinand Minding was born in Kalisz (Poland) and shortly after that his family moved to Hirschberg (now Jelenia Gora in Poland). He studied classical philology and philosophy at Halle and Berlin universities from 1824 to 1828. Working as a secondary school teacher he completed his thesis on approximate calculation of double integrals and successfully defended it at the University of Halle in 1829. Ferdinand Minding made a valuable contribution to the theory of surfaces. He defined the geodesic curvature of a curve and proved that this curvature is constant along the shortest curve encircling the given area on a surface. In the series of papers published from 1838 to 1849 Minding laid the foundations of the theory of surface bending. In 1864 he was elected to St. Petersburg Academy of Sciences as an associate-member and as a honorary member in 1879.

Minding lectured on the theory of curves and surfaces and among the mathematics students of the University of Tartu attending his lectures was Karl Peterson (1828–1881). He was born in Riga and studied mathematics at the University of Tartu from 1847 to 1852. In 1853 Peterson completed his thesis "On the bending of surfaces" and having defended it obtained the candidate degree. Upon graduation, he failed to get a position at the University of Tartu and moved to Moscow, where he served as a mathematics instructor at the Petropavlov specialized school.

In spite of an appreciation given by Minding to the Peterson' thesis "On the bending of surfaces" it was not published until 1952, when appeared the Russian translation of the thesis made by L. Depman. In Peterson' thesis we find two equations which can be written in the modern notations as follows

$$(0.1) \quad \frac{\partial \Delta}{\partial v} - \frac{\partial \Delta'}{\partial u} + \Gamma_{22}^2 \Delta - 2 \Gamma_{12}^2 \Delta' + \Gamma_{11}^2 \Delta'' = 0,$$

$$(0.2) \quad \frac{\partial \Delta''}{\partial u} - \frac{\partial \Delta'}{\partial v} + \Gamma_{22}^1 \Delta - 2 \Gamma_{12}^1 \Delta' + \Gamma_{11}^1 \Delta'' = 0,$$

where

$$\Delta = \frac{L}{\sqrt{EG - F^2}}, \quad \Delta' = \frac{M}{\sqrt{EG - F^2}}, \quad \Delta'' = \frac{N}{\sqrt{EG - F^2}},$$

and E, G, F are the coefficients of the first fundamental form g of a surface; L, N, M are the coefficients of the second fundamental form h of a surface and Γ_{jk}^i are Christoffel symbols. The equations (0.1), (0.2) play an essential role in the theory of surfaces. We remind that Gaussian curvature K of a surface can be written in

the form

$$(0.3) \quad K = \frac{LM - N^2}{EG - F^2}.$$

Substituting the Gaussian curvature K in the above formula by its expression in the terms of the coefficients of the first fundamental form g we obtain a relation between the coefficients of the first and second fundamental forms. It turns out that this relation and relations (0.1), (0.2) determine a surface up to congruence. By other words it can be proved that given two quadratic forms g, h , where g is positively definite, with coefficients satisfying the equations (0.1), (0.2), (0.3) there exists a surface whose first fundamental form is g , the second is h and a surface is determined up to congruence. Shortly after publication of the Russian translation of the Peterson' thesis it was generally recognized that Peterson was the first who obtained the fundamental equations of the theory of surfaces (0.1), (0.2) and anticipated the fundamental theorem of surface theory [31].

At the same time that Minding was studying the theory of surfaces, the subject was also occupying the attention of another scientist from the University of Tartu, Thomas Clausen (1801–1885). Thomas Clausen was born in Northern Jutland and having accepted an invitation to occupy the position of an astronomer-observer, he came to Tartu in 1842. Clausen interest towards the theory of surfaces was inspired by the paper of C.G.J. Jacobi, who tried to generalize the Gauss theorem about the sum of interior angles of a geodesic triangle. Casting doubt on the correctness of the results published by C.G.J. Jacobi, Clausen elaborated a new proof for the Gauss theorem. Inspired by an another Jacobi paper, where an integration of differential equation determining the geodesic lines of an ellipsoid was reduced to quadratures, Clausen showed that the same reduction can be made in the case of any non-developed second order surface. Clausen also studied the lunes of Hippocrates and he showed how two new types of squarable lunes with proportions of circular arcs 5:1 and 5:3 can be found. It should be also mentioned that Clausen found a new way of determining the lemniscate and this work is related to the field of geometrical constructions.

The successors of Minding on the chair of applied mathematics at the University of Tartu, who did research in the field of geometry, were Otto Staude (1857–1928) and Adolf Kneser (1862–1937). Staude was the first who began to construct the second order surfaces with the help of the tautened threads. He also studied the geodesic curvature of a line on a surface and the sign of the torsion of a curve. Adolf Kneser studied the algebraic lines by means of synthetic methods and he proved that if a plane curve has no other singularities except double tangents and only one double point, then it has only one double tangent.

Friedrich Schur (1856–1932) took up the post of the professor of pure mathematics at the University of Tartu in 1888, succeeding on this post to Peter Helmling (1817–1901), who retired the same year. Friedrich Schur took his doctoral degree at the University of Berlin with the thesis on the geometry of second order line complexes. Later Friedrich Schur studied the algebraic surfaces of third and fourth order and he made a valuable contribution to the development of differential geometry by stating the famous theorem on the spaces of constant curvature now bearing his name. Friedrich Schur spent only four years (1888–1892) at the University of Tartu. In this period he began to study the groups of continuous transformations, then the rapidly developing new branch of the differential geometry and due to his

achievements in this field, he can be reckoned a founder of this area of geometry among such mathematicians as S. Lie, F. Engel, L. Maurer and W. Killing.

Schur also studied the foundations of geometry. This is another trend of research which played an essential role in the development of geometry in Estonia. We only mention few names of the geometers of the University of Tartu whose scientific activity was related with the investigations on the foundations of geometry.

Leonid Lachtin (1863–1927) was a professor of pure mathematics at the University of Tartu for three years (1892–1895) succeeding Friedrich Schur to the post. He studied the Lobachevskian geometry and during his stay in Tartu published two papers devoted to this subject, studying in one of them the Poincaré interpretation of the Lobachevskian geometry. The successor of Lachtin to the post of professor of pure mathematics V. Alekseyev (1866–1943) studied the theory of the line congruences in connection with surface theory and the theory of rational invariants of bilinear forms.

The next 20th century is very significant in the history of Estonia because it was marked by the independence of Estonia. We touch gently the period from 1919 to 1950 because the special stress in this period was laid on the investigations of the foundations of geometry. The first professorship of mathematics at the University of Tartu in the independent Estonia was occupied by the Finnish mathematician Kalle Väisälä (1893–1968). He spent in Tartu three years (1919–1922) and then moved to Turku (Finland), where he took up the post of the professor of mathematics at the University of Turku. In the period from 1930 to 1940 the investigations of the foundations of geometry at the University of Tartu were continued in the papers of Jaan Sarv (1877–1954), Arnold Humal (1908–1987), Jüri Nuut (1892–1952) and it should be mentioned that the approach developed by these geometers was based on the notion of "betweenness", which is a ternary relation on the set of points of a straight line expressing the fact that one point lies between two others.

1. MINIMAL SURFACES AND SEMIPARALLEL SUBMANIFOLDS

In this section we proceed to the next period of the development of differential geometry in Estonia. This period covers the space of time from 1950s to the beginning of 1990s, and the development of differential geometry in this period in a great degree was influenced by Ülo Lumiste. Let us mark the main stages of Ülo Lumiste's scientific activity [5]. Lumiste was born in Vändra (Estonia) in 1929. He graduated from the University of Tartu in 1952 and then he was sent to Moscow for post-graduate studies at the Moscow University. In Moscow under the scientific supervision of professor A. Vassiliev, Lumiste completed his thesis devoted to the study of the geometry of submanifolds with fields of asymptotic multidimensional directions in space forms and, having successfully defended it, he obtained the candidate degree (equivalent to PhD). Then he was appointed to a post of assistant professor at the department of geometry of the University of Tartu. In 1963–1965 Lumiste held a position of post-doctoral researcher at the Moscow University. During this time he attended the seminars on differential geometry led by S.P. Finikov, G.F. Laptev and A.M. Vassiliev. Under the influence of these seminars he began to study the theory of connections in fibre bundles and its applications to geometry of families of homogeneous subspaces. These investigations formed the basis for his DSc thesis, and he defended it at the University of Kazan in 1968. In 1969 Lumiste was appointed to the post of professor at the department of algebra and geometry

of the University of Tartu. He retired in 1995 and at present Lumiste is a professor emeritus.

Lumiste initiated a research in the following areas of differential geometry:

- (1) the minimal and ruled surfaces, their generalizations;
- (2) canonical fibre bundles, induced connections and general theory of connections;
- (3) 2-parallel and semiparallel submanifolds;
- (4) connections in gauge theories.

Lumiste considerably contributed to each field of research from mentioned above and he also continued the investigations on the foundations of geometry started by his predecessors.

It is not possible to describe in a full extent the achievements of Ü. Lumiste within the limits of this paper, therefore we shall give only a brief description of the contribution of Lumiste to some fields mentioned above and let us begin with the theory of minimal surfaces. Lumiste showed in [12] that a minimal surface of constant Gaussian curvature (other than plane) exists only in the case of an elliptic space $S_n(c)$. He found all such surfaces for $n \leq 5$ and proved that the Gaussian curvature of a surface of this kind is $\frac{1c}{3}$ in the case of $S_4(c)$ (this is a so called Veronese surface) and the curvature of a minimal surface with constant Gaussian curvature equals to zero in the case of the elliptic spaces $S_3(c)$ and $S_5(c)$. It was also shown in the same paper that every minimal surface of constant Gaussian curvature is an orbit of a Lie group of isometries of a corresponding elliptic space. In [13] Lumiste proved the fundamental theorem for minimal surfaces, which states that a minimal surface is entirely determined by its inner metric, the principal curvatures and the angles between the principal directions of all orders. It was also shown in the same paper that every minimal surface can be bent continuously within its own class by leaving the values of first order principal curvatures fixed. In [14] Lumiste proved that each indicatrix of normal curvature of order l of a minimal surface is a circle if and only if the submanifold generated by the osculating planes of order $l-1$ is minimal.

This direction of research turned out to be very fruitful and Lumiste drew his student L. Tuulmets (b. 1933) in the investigations of the classes of 3-dimensional ruled surfaces in the 4-dimensional space R^4 , where R^4 can be either the Euclidean space E^4 or the Minkowski space $R^{1,3}$. The starting point for Tuulmets' investigations was the paper [11], where Lumiste elaborated the general theory of quasi-congruences in the Euclidean space E^4 . Tuulmets also studied the various classes of surfaces in the 4-dimensional Euclidean space E^4 , Minkowski space $R^{1,3}$, projective spaces P^n and the spaces of constant curvature, where she used the method of Cartan exterior forms and the systems of Pfaff equations [38]. The question of consistency of a system of Pfaff equations is very crucial in this kind of investigations, but it also requires a large volume of pure algebraic computations and Tuulmets assisted by an expert in the algebraic computer methods R. Roomeldi successfully applied computer methods in her investigations of Pfaff systems.

The congruences of null straight lines in the Minkowski space $R^{1,3}$ were studied by R. Kolde (b. 1938) [10]. He defined elliptic, hyperbolic and parabolic congruences of null straight lines with the help of the local properties of congruences. Using the notion of a central hypersurface, Kolde constructed the set of symmetric tensors related to the rays in the second order differential neighbourhoods. He

showed that these tensors could be used to canonize the frames in the case of the congruences of hyperbolic and elliptic types. In the case of a normal congruences it appeared that there were two different canonical frames. In the special case of elliptic congruences which are called isotropic similar canonical frames are determined up to a parameter. Kolde found the geometrical meaning of these canonical frames.

The next field of research initiated by Ü. Lumiste is the theory of canonical fibre bundles, induced connections and the general theory of connections [16] and [15]. A Grassmannian manifold of m -dimensional subspaces in Euclidean space or symplectic space can be considered as a fiber bundle, whose fibers are m -dimensional subspaces. There is a connection on this fiber bundle which can be defined in a natural way. This connection allows to study the geometry of a Grassmannian manifold by means of the curvature and the torsion of the mentioned above connection. This direction of research was developed by Lumiste's post-graduate students A. Parring (b. 1940), E. Abel (b. 1947) and A. Fleischer (b. 1948). Parring studied a family of $2m$ -dimensional symplectic subspaces in a $2n$ -dimensional affine-symplectic space interpreting this family as a fiber bundle, whose standard fiber is a symplectic subspace of this family [30]. The group of symplectic motions acts on each fiber of this fiber bundle. Parring used the curvature and the torsion of an inner connection to study the geometry of this fiber bundle and he also derived the structure equations of this family of symplectic subspaces. Abel considered a $(m+r)$ -dimensional surface V_{m+r} in the non-Euclidean space [1]. It can be shown that a surface V_{m+r} stratifies, where fibers are r -parametric families of m -dimensional non-Euclidean subspaces. Elaborating the ideas presented in the papers [16], [30] Abel defined three connections on a surface V_{m+r} and studied the properties of the torsion and the curvature of these connections. Fleischer studied homogeneous quotient spaces of the group of motions in Euclidean space E^4 and the Lie triple systems [7]. He also studied relations between reducibility of the holonomy group $\text{hol}(\nabla)$ and properties of the nonassociative algebra m with multiplication defined by the tensor A [6]. Fleischer proved that if $M = G/H$ is a Riemannian non-symmetric reductive homogeneous space of a simple Lie group G and the isotropy representation of H has only inequivalent irreducible components, then any invariant metric connection on M has irreducible holonomy group.

Now we go on to the next field of research initiated by Lumiste which is the theory of semiparallel submanifolds. Given a m -dimensional smooth manifold M^m immersed isometrically into a n -dimensional Euclidean space E^n one has two quadratic differential forms associated with this submanifold, where one of them is the first fundamental form $g = g_{ij} dx^i dx^j$, $i, j = 1, 2, \dots, m$, where $x^1, x^2, \dots, x^m$ are the local coordinates of M^m , determined by the metric (g_{ij}) , and the other is the second fundamental form $h = h_{ij} dx^i dx^j$ with values in the normal vector bundle over a submanifold M^m (the fiber of this vector bundle at a point p of a submanifold M^m is the orthogonal complement of the tangent space $T_p M^m$ of a submanifold M^m with respect to the whole Euclidean space E^n). It is well known that the first fundamental form g is always parallel, i.e., $\nabla g = 0$, where ∇ is the Levi-Civita connection, but the second fundamental form h does not need to be parallel. We remind that a submanifold M^m in a Euclidean space E^n is said to be a parallel submanifold if $\bar{\nabla} h = 0$, where $\bar{\nabla}$ is the van der Waerden-Bortolotti connection on a submanifold M^m which is a pair of the Levi-Civita connection ∇ and the normal

connection $\nabla^\perp$, i.e., $\bar{\nabla} = \nabla \oplus \nabla^\perp$. If $\{e_\alpha\}$, where $\alpha = m+1, \dots, n$, is an adapted orthonormal local frame of the normal vector bundle, then $h_{ij} = h_{ij}^\alpha e_\alpha$ and the components h_{ijk}^α of $\bar{\nabla}h$ determined by $h_{ijk}^\alpha = \bar{\nabla}_i h_{kj}^\alpha$ can be expressed in terms of the components of the second fundamental (mixed) tensor h_{ij}^α as follows:

$$(1.1) \quad h_{ijk}^\alpha \omega^k = dh_{ij}^\alpha - h_{kj}^\alpha \omega_i^k - h_{ik}^\alpha \omega_j^k + h_{ij}^\beta \omega_\beta^\alpha,$$

where ω_i^j are the connection 1-forms of the Levi-Civita connection ∇ and ω_β^α the connection 1-forms of the normal connection $\nabla^\perp$. In the case of a parallel submanifold M^m the components of $\bar{\nabla}h$ are all equal to zero, i.e., $h_{ijk}^\alpha = 0$. Applying the exterior differential to the both sides of (1.1), we obtain

$$(1.2) \quad \bar{\nabla}h_{ijk}^\alpha \wedge \omega^k = h_{ij}^\beta \Omega_\beta^\alpha - h_{kj}^\alpha \Omega_i^k - h_{ik}^\alpha \Omega_j^k,$$

where Ω_i^k is the curvature 2-form of the Levi-Civita connection ∇ and Ω_β^α is the curvature 2-form of the normal connection $\nabla^\perp$. The above relation (1.2) gives us the integrability condition for the differential system $\bar{\nabla}h = 0$ which is

$$(1.3) \quad h_{ij}^\beta \Omega_\beta^\alpha - h_{kj}^\alpha \Omega_i^k - h_{ik}^\alpha \Omega_j^k = 0.$$

A submanifold M^m is said to be a semiparallel submanifold if the integrability condition (1.3) is satisfied.

The term *semiparallel submanifolds* for submanifolds with second fundamental form satisfying (1.3) was introduced by J. Deprez in 1985. At the same time Lumiste together with his post-graduate student V. Mirzoyan independently began to study an interesting and important class of submanifolds with parallel $\bar{\nabla}h$, which form the subclass in the class of the semiparallel submanifolds as it follows from (1.3). It should be noted that Deprez only classified and described the semiparallel surfaces M_2 and hypersurfaces M_{n-1} in E_n while in the main the theory of semiparallel surfaces was developed by Lumiste. The theorem asserting that any semiparallel submanifold M_m in a space form $M_n(c)$ is the second order envelope of an orbit of a Lie group of isometries was proved by Lumiste in 1990 and this theorem plays a crucial role in the theory of semiparallel submanifolds since it suggests that in order to develop the theory of semiparallel submanifolds one should first of all to find all the symmetric orbits and then to describe the second order envelopes of these orbits. It can be shown that any symmetric orbit is an orthogonal product of irreducible ones, where an irreducible orbit is a minimal submanifold in its sphere (except the case when irreducible orbit is a plane). Lumiste showed that some irreducible orbits can be constructed by means of mappings which are known in the algebraic geometry. It turned out that symmetric orbits of certain kind which arise in the connection with the study of semiparallel submanifolds, whose first normal subspace at any point has the maximal possible dimension $\frac{1}{2}m(m+1)$, were earlier introduced and studied by R. Mullari (1931–1969) [28] and [29] who was Lumiste's first post-graduate student. Mullari considered a symmetric orbit which is a space of constant curvature immersed into E_n in such a way that all its inner motions are generated by isometries of E_n and $n = \frac{1}{2}m(m+3)$, where m is the dimension of an orbit. He called this kind of symmetric orbit *maximal symmetric*. Later they were given the name *Veronese orbits* because any of these orbits can be constructed as the image of the m -dimensional sphere S_m with respect to Veronese mapping. The theorem proved by Lumiste [18] states that if $m \geq 2$ and $n = \frac{1}{2}m(m+3)$, then

a complete semiparallel submanifold M_m in E_n with maximal possible dimension $\frac{1}{2}m(m+1)$ of the first normal subspace at any point is a single Veronese orbit.

The study of three-dimensional semiparallel submanifolds in E_6 (see [25] and [19]) led to a symmetric orbit, which is generated by one-parameter family of 2-spheres, whose orthogonal trajectories are circles. The direct generalization of this is a *Segre submanifold* $S_{(m_1, m_2)}$, which can be constructed by means of the Segre map known in algebraic geometry. The second order envelopes for Segre orbits can be found in [24]. This direction of research is also developed by K. Riives (b. 1942). Riives proved [34] that a semiparallel submanifold M^4 of a Euclidean space E^n , $n > 9$ is a second order envelope of $V^2(r_1) \times S^1(r_2) \times S^1(r_3)$ (where $V^2(r_1)$ is a Veronese surface in E^5). In the same paper some geometrical properties of Veronese and Clifford leaves are described in terms of a certain function. Using the Cartan moving frame method and the exterior differential calculus Riives described in [35] some special classes of curves on irreducible envelopes of the reducible symmetric submanifolds $V^2(r_1) \times S^1(r_2) \times S^1(r_3)$ with a Veronese component, which is a Veronese surface in E^5 .

The third class of symmetric orbits, which were found by Lumiste in the connection with the study of semiparallel submanifolds and can be constructed with the help of a mapping known in algebraic geometry. Let $G_{k,l}$ be the Grassmannian (k -dimensional subspaces of the real Euclidean space E_l) and $T^{(0,k)} \subset (E_l^*)^{\otimes k}$ be the space of skew-symmetric k -covariant tensors. We can consider the Grassmannian $G_{k,l}$ as a submanifold in $T^{(0,k)}$, where it turns to be an orbit. It should be noted that the geometry of $G_{k,l}$ was also studied by Lumiste's post-graduate student I. Maasikas (b. 1944) in [27]. Lumiste proved in [21] that this orbit is a symmetric orbit only in the case of $k = 2$ (it is called the Plücker orbit). Later he showed that the second order envelope of Plücker orbit $G_{2,l}$ is trivial, which means that it is neither more nor less than the same orbit. Lumiste introduced the term *umbilic-like orbits* for the symmetric orbits, whose second order envelopes are trivial. He has shown that the class of umbilic-like orbits includes not only the previously mentioned Plücker orbits, but also the unitary orbits and Veronese-Grassmann orbits. These results are summarized by Lumiste in his monographs [23] and [24].

Lumiste's post-graduate student M. Väljas (b. 1958) studied totally quasiumbilical submanifolds with nonflat normal connection and he proved in joint paper with Ü. Lumiste [26] the existence of totally quasiumbilical submanifolds in Euclidean spaces with codimension 2 having a non-flat normal connection. He also studied Dupin-Mannheim submanifolds and Clifford cones in E_{n+m} [40]. The other Lumiste's post-graduate student T. Vorovere (b. 1957) studied the evolute of order λ for a submanifold in a Euclidean space. A submanifold N in E^n is called the evolute of order λ for a submanifold M^m in E^n , if there exists a submersion $f : N \rightarrow M$ such that the osculating plate of order $(\lambda - 1)$ of N at a point $y \in N$ belong to the normal space to M at $f(x)$, and moreover, the osculating plane intersects M at $f(x)$. Virovere derived several criteria for the existence of evolutes (see [39]).

2. FIBER BUNDLES, CONNECTIONS AND GAUGE THEORIES

The question about the nature of a space and time has always stirred up the minds of philosophers, mathematicians and physicists. The geometry provides us

with various mathematical models of a space and this is the reason why the development of geometry has been so closely related to the development of classical mechanics and theoretical physics. The appearance of non-abelian gauge theories in 50s of the 20th century gave a powerful impetus to this relation. It is well known that the theory of connections on principal and vector bundles is an adequate geometric framework for the non-abelian gauge theories. There were favorable conditions in Tartu in 70s to elaborate the relation between theory of connections and gauge theories because there was a group of physicists at the Institute of Physics studying the gauge theories and a group of geometers at the Department of Geometry and Algebra of the University of Tartu studying the theory of connections on fiber bundles. The physicists felt the need of basic knowledge in differential geometry of fiber bundles such as connection, curvature, characteristic classes (or Chern classes) and this led to the joint seminar with geometers, which ran for several years (usually once a week). This seminar was initiated by Madis Kõiv on the part of physicists and by Ülo Lumiste on the part of geometers. This collaboration turned out to be very fruitful and it had not only educational importance but it also led to an original research in the areas such as Backlund transformations, quantum Yang-Mills theory, supersymmetry, supermanifolds and supergravity. In this paper we shall briefly describe the investigations concerning a geometrical meaning of the Faddeev-Popov ghost fields and BRST-transformations. The first non-abelian gauge field theory with the gauge group $SU(2)$ was constructed by Yang and Mills (see [41]). From a geometric point of view an adequate space for Yang-Mills theory is a principal fiber bundle $P(M, G)$, where M is the smooth four dimensional manifold and $G = SU(2)$ is the structure group of P called a gauge group in field theory. A connection 1-form ω determines the Yang-Mills field potentials. Indeed let $\pi : P \rightarrow M$ be a projection of a principal fiber bundle P and $\sigma : V \rightarrow \pi^{-1}(V)$ be a section of some local trivialization of P over an open subset V of M . Then the pull-back of a connection form $\sigma^*\omega$ is the Lie algebra $su(2)$ -valued 1-form on a subset V and can be expressed in local coordinates x^μ of V as follows $\sigma^*\omega = A_\mu^{(V)} dx^\mu$. If the coefficients $A_\mu^{(V)}$ satisfy the Yang-Mills equations one can interpret them as Yang-Mills field potentials. A connection 1-form ω with coefficients of its pull-back $\sigma^*\omega$ satisfying the Yang-Mills equations is called a *Yang-Mills connection* and its pull-back $\sigma^*\omega$ a *Yang-Mills 1-form*. If U is some other open subset of M such that $U \cap V \neq \emptyset$ and the section $\xi : U \rightarrow \pi^{-1}(U)$ of a local trivialization over U is related to the section σ by the G -valued function $g(x)$, i.e.,

$$\xi(x) = \sigma(x) g(x), \quad x \in U \cap V,$$

then the pull-back $\xi^*\omega$ of a connection on U is related to the pull-back $\sigma^*\omega$ as follows

$$\xi^*\omega = Ad(g^{-1}(x)) \sigma^*\omega + g^{-1}(x) dg(x).$$

If $\xi^*\omega = A_\mu^{(U)} dx^\mu$, then the above relation leads to the relation between the corresponding Yang-Mills potentials

$$(2.1) \quad A_\mu^{(U)} = g^{-1}(x) A_\mu^{(V)} g(x) + g^{-1}(x) \partial_\mu g(x),$$

which is the gauge transformation in a non-abelian case. The curvature 2-form

$$(2.2) \quad \Omega = D_\omega \omega = d\omega + \frac{1}{2} [\omega, \omega],$$

where D_ω is the covariant differential, written in local coordinates

$$(2.3) \quad \Omega = F_{\mu\nu} dx^\mu dx^\nu,$$

determines the strength $F_{\mu\nu}$ of a Yang-Mills field, which can be expressed in the terms of potentials as follows

$$(2.4) \quad F_{\mu\nu} = \partial_\mu A_\nu - \partial_\nu A_\mu + [A_\mu, A_\nu].$$

The Yang-Mills action

$$(2.5) \quad S_{YM} = \frac{1}{4} \int_M \langle \Omega, * \Omega \rangle,$$

where $*$ is the (Hodge) star operator and $\langle, \rangle$ is a Killing form on the Lie algebra $su(2)$, is invariant with respect to gauge transformations.

An invariance of the action S_{YM} with respect to gauge transformations (2.1) brings a distinguishing feature in the Yang-Mills field theory or, in a more general context, in any non-abelian gauge field theory. Indeed, it shows that the real physical configuration of a gauge field theory is determined not by a single set of field potentials $A = \{A_\mu(x)\}$, but by the entire class of gauge equivalent sets of field potentials, where two sets $A = \{A_\mu(x)\}$ and $A' = \{A'_\mu(x)\}$ are said to be gauge equivalent if

$$(2.6) \quad A'_\mu = g^{-1}(x) A_\mu g(x) + g^{-1}(x) \partial_\mu g(x).$$

Thus a real physical configuration is determined up to a gauge transformation. The complications which arise in a quantization of a gauge theory are caused just by this ambiguity. This problem can be fixed by a parametrization of the space of real physical configurations where each real physical configuration will be uniquely determined by a single set of parameters. This can be done by imposing an additional condition on Yang-Mills potentials and this condition should pick out a single representative from every gauge equivalent class. This condition is called *gauge-fixing condition* or simply gauge in gauge field theories.

The quantum Yang-Mills field theory was constructed by L. Faddeev, V. Popov, B. De Witt and they showed that the approach of R. Feynman based on functional integral was most suitable scheme for quantization of gauge field theories because the principle of gauge invariance could be expressed in terms of this approach very easily: one should integrate not over the space of all field configurations, but only over the space of gauge-equivalent classes of field configurations. However applying this procedure to the Yang-Mills field theory one encounters a problem of the non-local functional $\det M$, where M is the operator

$$M(\alpha) = \partial^\mu \partial_\mu \alpha - \partial^\mu [A_\mu, \alpha],$$

which appears in the functional integral for S -matrix. This was the reason why the integrand in the functional integral of generating functional was not in the canonical form $\exp(i \times \text{action})$. Faddeev and Popov solved this problem by introducing the additional anticommuting fields $c(x)$ and $\bar{c}(x)$, which allow to put the determinant $\det M$ into a form of the integral over the infinite dimensional Grassmann algebra $\mathcal{R}$ (here $c(x)$ and $\bar{c}(x)$ are the generators of this algebra) as follows

$$(2.7) \quad \det M = \int \exp\{i \int \bar{c}^a(x) M^{ab} c^b(x) dx\} \prod_x d\bar{c} dc.$$

The anticommuting fields $c(x)$ and $\bar{c}(x)$ were later given the name of *Faddeev-Popov ghost fields*. It was showed by C. Becchi, A. Rouet, R. Stora and independently by

I. Tyutin that the quantum effective action (this is the action one obtains by adding to the classical Yang-Mills action the terms generated by the Faddeev-Popov ghost fields) is invariant with respect to transformations

$$(2.8) \quad A_\mu^a(x) \rightarrow A_\mu^a(x) + \nabla_\mu c^a(x) \epsilon,$$

$$(2.9) \quad c^a(x) \rightarrow c^a(x) - \frac{1}{2} t_{bd}^a c^b(x) c^d(x) \epsilon,$$

$$(2.10) \quad \bar{c}^a(x) \rightarrow \bar{c}^a(x) + [\partial_\mu A_\mu^a(x)] \epsilon,$$

where t_{bd}^a are the structure constants of the Lie algebra $su(2)$, ∇_μ is the covariant derivative and ϵ is a Grassmann parameter $\epsilon^2 = 0$ anticommuting with the Faddeev-Popov fields and commuting with the Yang-Mills potentials. The transformations (2.8)–(2.10) are called the *BRST transformations*. This kind of transformations is known in the modern field theory under the name of *supersymmetries*. The remarkable property of the BRST transformations is that they are nilpotent. The BRST transformations induce the BRST operator

$$(2.11) \quad \delta A_\mu^a(x) = \nabla_\mu c^a(x), \quad \delta c^a(x) = -\frac{1}{2} t_{bd}^a c^b(x) c^d(x), \quad \delta \bar{c}^a(x) = \partial_\mu A_\mu^a(x),$$

definition of BRST operator is usually replaced by an auxiliary field $b^a(x)$ and the last formula in (2.11) takes on the form $\delta \bar{c}^a(x) = b^a(x)$. Later the anti-BRST operator $\bar{\delta}$ was added to BRST operator and together they form the *BRST-algebra*

$$(2.12) \quad \delta^2 = \bar{\delta}^2 = 0 \quad \delta \bar{\delta} + \bar{\delta} \delta = 0.$$

The appearance of the Faddeev-Popov ghost fields in the quantum Yang-Mills theory raised an interesting problem of elaborating a geometric structure which could allow to incorporate these additional fields into known geometric framework of gauge fields based on fiber bundle technique and to derive the BRST transformations from known equations. The property of anticommutativity of the ghost fields suggests an idea to construct their geometric interpretation by means of differential forms since the wedge product of differential 1-forms is also skew-symmetric. This idea seems to be very alluring if we look at the BRST transformation of the ghost fields (2.9) which is very similar to the Cartan-Maurer equation and this suggests to construct the BRST operator by means of exterior derivative. The geometric interpretation of the ghost fields and BRST transformations based on the mentioned above idea was proposed and developed in the papers [36] and [37]. Though the geometric interpretation of the ghost fields and BRST operators in terms of differential forms and exterior derivative is very attractive, it has a problem with that part of BRST operator δ which is determined by the transformation of the anti-ghost field (2.10). Indeed, the BRST operator δ transforms the anti-ghost field $\bar{c}^a(x)$ into an auxiliary bosonic field $b^a(x)$ and therefore this part of the BRST operator is not consistent with the properties of the exterior derivative which raises the degree of a form by 1. In [17] Lumiste improved the interpretation proposed in [36] and [37] and extended it framework to include the anti-ghost fields $\bar{c}(x)$ and the anti-BRST operator $\bar{\delta}$. The geometric construction, he proposed for interpretation of the ghost field $c(x)$, was not so rigid as in [36] and [37] and this allowed to keep the dependence of $c(x)$ on a gauge-fixing condition. He also showed that BRST transformations for the fields $A_\mu(x)$ and $c(x)$ could be derived from the well known Laptev equations for a connection on a principal fiber bundle $P(M, G)$. Lumiste

elaborated a formalism of q -vector fields considered as $(-q)$ -forms for geometric interpretation of the anti-ghost field $\bar{c}(x)$ and an analogue of the exterior derivative, which can be used together with the well known operator $\star^{-1} d \star$, where $\star$ is the Hodge operator, for geometric interpretation of the anti-BRST operator $\bar{\delta}$. Let us briefly describe the geometric construction elaborated in [17]. Let z be a point of a principal fiber bundle $\pi : P \rightarrow M$ with a structure group G , $p = \pi(z) \in M$ be the projection of z and S_z be a subspace of the tangent space $T_z P$ such that $T_z P = S_z \oplus V_z P$, where $V_z P$ is the tangent space to the fiber $\pi^{-1}(p)$ passing through a point z . Let $\mathcal{J}_P(z)$ be the set of all subspaces S_z at a point z satisfying $T_z P = S_z \oplus V_z P$. It can be proved that the set $\mathcal{J}_P = \bigcup_{z \in P} \mathcal{J}_P(z)$ is the smooth manifold, which can be endowed with a structure of the principal fiber bundle over P with the projection $\pi' : \mathcal{J}_P \rightarrow P$ defined by $\pi'(S_z) = z$. If $R_g(z) = zg$ is the right action of the group G on a principal bundle P , then the right action R_g^* of G on $\mathcal{J}_P$ is defined by $R_g^*(S_z) = S_{zg} = dR_g(S_z)$, where $dR_g : T_z P \rightarrow T_{zg} P$ is the differential of R_g .

Let $\mathcal{V}(P)$ be the Lie algebra of vertical (or fundamental) vector fields on P . It is well known that this Lie algebra is isomorphic to the Lie algebra $\underline{G}$ of G , i.e., $\mathcal{V}(P) \simeq \underline{G}$. If Y is a fundamental vector field then let us denote by ξ_Y the corresponding element of the Lie algebra $\underline{G}$ which induces Y . Let $\Sigma : P \rightarrow \mathcal{J}_P$ be a smooth section of the principal bundle $\mathcal{J}_P$. Any section Σ generates the $\underline{G}$ -valued 1-form θ on P which is defined as follows: if X is a vector field on P , then X can be written as the sum of two vector fields Y and Z , where $Z_p \in \Sigma(p)$ and Y is the uniquely determined vertical vector field, and

$$(2.13) \quad \theta(X) = \xi_Y.$$

The $\underline{G}$ -valued 1-form θ induces the $\underline{G}$ -valued 1-form $\tilde{\theta}$ on the principal bundle $\mathcal{J}_P$ and the value of this form on a tangent vector $\tilde{v}$ to $\mathcal{J}_P$ at a point S_z is determined by the formula

$$(2.14) \quad \tilde{\theta}(\tilde{v}) = \theta_z(d\pi'(\tilde{v})).$$

In [17] Lumiste proposed to consider the $\underline{G}$ -valued 1-form $\tilde{\theta}$ as a geometric interpretation for the Faddeev-Popov ghost field c . A smooth section Σ used in the construction of $\tilde{\theta}$ can be interpreted in terms of a gauge theory as a gauge-fixing condition and this shows the advantage of the approach proposed by Lumiste which allows to keep the dependence of the ghost field on a gauge.

The geometric interpretation of ghost fields and BRST-supersymmetries in terms of differential forms suffers from a shortcoming, which does not allow to take into account all properties of the ghost fields. It is important that ghost fields $c^a(x)$ and $\bar{c}^b(x)$ are the generators of an infinite dimensional Grassmann algebra $\mathcal{R}$ as it is mentioned above. This means that ghost fields anticommute not only with respect to superscripts a and b , but also with respect to a point x of a base manifold M , i.e.,

$$(2.15) \quad c^a(x) c^b(y) = -c^b(y) c^a(x),$$

where x and y are points of a base manifold M . The commutation relations (2.15) show that if we consider the ghost fields as generators of an infinite dimensional Grassmann algebra, then the product of the ghost fields $c^a(x)$ and $c^b(y)$ is determined even if x and y are different point of a manifold M . It is well known that one can multiply differential forms pointwise and the product of two differential

forms has no sense if they are taken in different points of a manifold. In order to incorporate the anticommutation relations (2.15) into a geometric interpretation Lumiste and the author of this paper constructed an infinite dimensional supermanifold $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{R}}$ (see [3]). There are few approaches to a notion of a supermanifold and one of them was proposed by F. Berezin. Briefly it can be described as follows: given an ordinary smooth manifold M one constructs a supermanifold by means of the theory of sheaves, where M is usually called an underlying or a base manifold. The underlying manifold $\mathcal{A}$ for an infinite dimensional supermanifold $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{R}}$ proposed in [3] was the infinite dimensional manifold of all smooth connections of a given principal fiber bundle $P(M, G)$, where the differential structure was defined with the help of a Banach space structure, and the sheaves determining the structure of a supermanifold were constructed with the help of infinite dimensional Grassmann algebra $\mathcal{R}$. Figuratively speaking this supermanifold was infinite dimensional with respect to both sectors, even and odd. The underlying manifold of all smooth connections $\mathcal{A}$ has a rich geometric structure. It is well known that it is an infinite dimensional principal fiber bundle with respect to the action of the infinite dimensional Lie group of gauge transformations and a gauge-fixing condition can be considered as a section of this bundle. Given a smooth function determined on an ordinary manifold M one can extend it to the smooth function on the supermanifold constructed over M . This procedure is called a Grassmann analytical continuation in the theory of supermanifolds. The Yang-Mills action (2.5) can be considered as a function on the infinite dimensional manifold of the classes of gauge-equivalent connections and the infinite dimensional supermanifold $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{R}}$ proposed in [3] allowed to show that the quantum effective action is a Grassmann analytical continuation of the Yang-Mills action (2.5) along the fibers of the corresponding principal fiber bundle (determined by the action of the group of gauge transformations). The BRST-supersymmetries were interpreted as a family of vector fields on the infinite dimensional supermanifold $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{R}}$.

3. JET BUNDLES AND SYMMETRIES OF DIFFERENTIAL EQUATIONS

Every time when we solve a differential equation, study the singularities of a mapping or compute the invariants of a Lie group we (in some way or other) use the structure of a jet space $J_{n,m}$, which means that we make use of the operator of total differentiation, Cartan' forms and Lie vector fields. This direction of research in the area of differential geometry is developed by Mado Rahula who succeeded to Ülo Lumiste on the post of professor of geometry at the University of Tartu in 1990 when Lumiste retired.

Let us list the main periods of Mado Rahula biography. Rahula was born in Järvamaa (Estonia) in 1936. When he was 13 years old his family was banished to Siberia during the Stalin' deportations. He graduated the University of Tomsk in 1959 and then came back to Estonia, where he had the luck to enter the post-graduate studies at the University of Tartu under the supervision of Lumiste though according to the system existing at that time the members of deported families were forbidden to enter the universities located in the european part of the Soviet Union. Rahula defended his PhD thesis "On higher order differential geometry" at the University of Tartu in 1964. He spent four years (1967–1971) in Algeria teaching mathematics at the University of Algeria within the framework of the program of cooperation of the Soviet Union with developing countries. The next

period (1972–1989) of his life was bound up with the Institute of Technology in Odessa.

Let us consider the jet space $J_{n,m}$ in the simplest case of $n = m = 1$. Let

$$(3.1) \quad t, u, u', u'', \dots$$

be the coordinates in this space. The operator of total differentiation

$$(3.2) \quad D = \frac{\partial}{\partial t} + u' \frac{\partial}{\partial u} + u'' \frac{\partial}{\partial u'} + \dots,$$

can be considered as a linear vector field. The flow (i.e., the one-parameter group of diffeomorphisms generated by this vector field) is determined by the exponential law

$$(3.3) \quad U' = C U \quad \text{and} \quad U_t = e^{Ct} U,$$

where U is the column with infinite number of entries $u, u', u'', \dots$ and C is the infinite-dimensional matrix, whose non-zero elements can be obtained from the elements of the main diagonal of the infinite-dimensional unit matrix by moving each of them to the right along the corresponding row to the next position. It is obvious that the matrix C^l , where l is an integer, can be obtained from the unit matrix by repeating l times the previously described procedure. The exponential of the matrix Ct , where t is a parameter, multiplied from the right by the column U yields the column U_t whose first element

$$(3.4) \quad u_t = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} u^{(k)} \frac{t^k}{k!},$$

and the next elements are the derivatives of u_t , i.e., $u'_t, u''_t, \dots$. Thus the formula $U_t = e^{Ct} U$ describes the motion of a point (t, U_t) along the trajectory of the vector field D . In a general case of a jet space $J_{n,m}$ we have the system of operators D_i , $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$ and the formula $U_t = e^{Ct} U$ written by means of multi-indices determines the n -dimensional orbits of the additive group $\mathbf{R}^n$.

Let us denote by $\frac{\partial}{\partial U}$ the matrix whose single row consists of the elements

$$(3.5) \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial u}, \frac{\partial}{\partial u'}, \frac{\partial}{\partial u''}, \dots$$

Then the operator D can be written in the form

$$(3.6) \quad D = \frac{\partial}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial}{\partial U} U'.$$

The entries of the matrix $(\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \frac{\partial}{\partial U})$ form the basis in the jet space $J_{1,1}$ and the entries of the matrix $(\frac{dt}{dU})$ form the dual basis. If we replace the first entry $\frac{\partial}{\partial t}$ in the first matrix by the operator of total differentiation D then the first entry in the second matrix containing the elements of dual basis should be replaced by the Cartan form $\omega = dU - U' dt$. This follows from the formulae

$$(D \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial U}) = (\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial U}) \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ U' & E \end{pmatrix}, \quad \begin{pmatrix} dt \\ \omega \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ -U' & E \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} dt \\ dU \end{pmatrix}.$$

The basis and its dual basis depend on a point of the jet space and if this point starts to move along the trajectory of the vector field D passing through this point, then both bases change and this change or dependence on a parameter t can be described by the same exponential law (3.3). Indeed, if

$$\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial U} \right) = - \frac{\partial}{\partial U} C \quad \text{and} \quad \omega' = C \omega,$$

where the stroke stands for the Lie derivative with respect to D , then

$$\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial U}\right)_t = \frac{\partial}{\partial U} e^{-Ct} \text{ and } \omega_t = e^{Ct} \omega.$$

The formula $I = e^{-Ct} U$ determines an infinite number of invariants of the operator D . Indeed, we have $I' = e^{-Ct} (U' - CU) = 0$ and taking into account $dI = e^{-Ct} \omega$, we conclude that the exponential e^{-Ct} is an integrating matrix for the system of forms ω . The dual formula

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial I} = \frac{\partial}{\partial U} e^{Ct}$$

determines an infinite number of invariant operators. These operators form the basis for Lie vector fields and for infinitesimal symmetries of the operator D .

Any vector field P can be written in the above defined bases as follows

$$(3.7) \quad P = \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \xi + \frac{\partial}{\partial U} \lambda = D\xi + \frac{\partial}{\partial U} \mu = D\xi + \frac{\partial}{\partial I} \nu,$$

where $\lambda = PU$, $\mu = \omega(D)$, $\nu = PI$, $\mu = \lambda - U' \xi$, and $\nu = e^{-Ct} \mu$. It can be proved that the following conditions are equivalent to each other:

- (1) vector field P is a Lie vector field;
- (2) $\nu' = 0$;
- (3) $\mu' = C\mu$;
- (4) $\lambda' = C\lambda + U' \xi'$.

The second condition is the simplest one, and it shows that the components of ν are the invariants of the field D . The third condition shows that the entries of the column μ are $f, f', f'', \dots$, where f is a generating function. For instance the functions $1, t, t^2/2, \dots$ are the generating functions for the field $\frac{\partial}{\partial I}$ which is a vertical vector field since $\xi = 0$. The fourth condition is more complicated since a generating function does not enter it explicitly, but this condition determines the components of a Lie vector field in the natural basis. It should be mentioned that the fourth condition can be found in the classical Lie theory.

The above described general scheme was developed by Rahula and its more detailed description can be found in the monograph [32]. This scheme can be applied in the theory of differential equations. Let $F(t, U) = 0$ be a differential equation, which we shall write in the form $F = 0$. This equation determines the surface A_0 in the jet space $J_{1,1}$. The stratification of singularities $A_0 \supset A_1 \supset A_2 \supset \dots$ is defined on the surface A_0 by means of the flow of the vector field D , where A_n is determined by the system of equations $F^{(k)} = 0$, where $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots, n$. The solutions of $F = 0$ can be constructed by means of those trajectories of the operator D which belong to A_n for each integer n . The integral of an equation $F = 0$ is determined by a function which is constant on the surface A_0 . The symmetries of $F = 0$ are the transformations of the jet space $J_{1,1}$ such that they leave invariant the stratification arising on the surface A_0 . The symmetries of $F = 0$ considered as mappings transform a solution of $F = 0$ into another solution of a same equation and they do the same thing with the integrals of $F = 0$. Thus we can conclude that the flow of a vector field reproduces the solutions of a differential equation.

It is useful to consider a Lie vector field as an extended group operator. Any differential invariant (for example, the curvature of a curve or the curvature of a surface) is the invariant of a Lie vector field. Determination of symmetries in some

sense an inverse problem for the Erlanger Program of F. Klein (1872). Indeed, the main aim of the Erlanger Program is to find the set of all properties of a set S that remain invariant when the elements of this set are subjected to the transformations of some Lie group of transformations.

An advantage of this approach is that it is based on a jet space whose structure is universal. Indeed, let us consider the triple (D, t, U) in the jet space $J_{1,1}$, where D is the operator of total differentiation, t is the canonical parameter for D (it can be interpreted as a time) and U is the set of coordinates of a fiber. Given the triple (X, s, F) , where X is a vector field defined on a manifold M , s is the canonical parameter for X and F is the system of functions $Xf, X^2f, \dots$ generated by a smooth function f defined on M , we can always relate this triple to the triple (D, t, U) with the help of a mapping $\varphi : M \rightarrow J_{1,1}$ satisfying

$$(3.8) \quad t \circ \varphi = 0, \quad U \circ \varphi = F \quad \text{and} \quad (DI) \circ \varphi = X(I \circ \varphi),$$

where I is an arbitrary function defined on the space $J_{1,1}$. In this way we can carry over any invariant of the operator D from the jet space $J_{1,1}$ onto a manifold M , where it will be the invariant of a vector field X . Particularly the invariants $I \circ \varphi = e^{Cs} F$ on a manifold M correspond to the invariants $I = e^{Ct} U$ defined on the jet space. The covariant tensor fields including the differential forms can be carried over from the jet space $J_{1,1}$ onto a manifold M , where the differential operators such as the Monge-Ampere operator, Laplacian, Hessian, curvature operator and so on can be constructed by means of these differential forms.

Thus we can use the structures defined on a jet space $J_{n,m}$ to get a necessary information about the operators on a manifold M , their invariants and symmetries. The set of all triples (X, s, F) can be viewed as a category and the triple (D, t, U) is a finite object of this category. A universal problem is to construct an initial element or a finite element of this category, and the structure of a jet space $J_{n,m}$, which can be used to solve this problem, is universal just in this sense. The structures briefly described in this section, their analysis and possible applications have been in detail described in the monograph [33].

The geometric structures arising in the theory of differential equations were also studied by H. Kilp (b. 1942) in [9] and [8].

4. NONCOMMUTATIVE GEOMETRY AND GENERALIZATION OF SUPERSYMMETRY

In this section we describe a direction of research in the field of differential geometry, which was initiated by R. Kerner (University Paris VI) at the beginning of 1990s and later developed in cooperation with the colleagues from Paris, Wroclaw (Poland) and the author of this paper. This direction is related to the noncommutative geometry. During the last decade a spectacular development of noncommutative generalizations of differential geometry and Lie group theory has been achieved. The respective new chapters of mathematical physics are known under the names of *noncommutative geometry*, *quantum groups* and *quantum spaces*. This section is based on the paper [4].

Let us consider an associative algebra $\mathcal{G}$ over complex numbers with generators $\theta^A, A = 1, 2, \dots, N$ satisfying the *ternary* relations

$$(4.1) \quad \theta^A \theta^B \theta^C = j \theta^B \theta^C \theta^A,$$

where j is a primitive cube root of unity. We suppose that the N^2 products $\theta^A \theta^B$ are linearly independent entities. The algebra $\mathcal{G}$ with ternary commutation relations

(4.1) is called a *ternary Grassmann algebra* [4], because the commutation relations (4.1) are very similar to the commutation relations of a classical Grassmann algebra. Indeed, if θ^α with $\alpha = 1, 2, \dots, n$ are the generators of the Grassmann algebra with n generators, then they are subjected to the well known relations $\theta^\alpha \theta^\beta = (-1)^{\theta^\beta \theta^\alpha}$ which can be interpreted as follows: each permutation of generators in the binary product $\theta^\alpha \theta^\beta$ is accompanied by multiplication by -1 and -1 is considered as a primitive square root of unity. Thus one can get a ternary analogue of the Grassmann algebra replacing a binary product of generators by a ternary product, a permutation of two objects by a cyclic permutation of three objects and a primitive square root of unity by a primitive cube root of unity. It is obvious that ternary analogue of Grassmann algebra is based on a faithful representation of the cyclic group $\mathbb{Z}_3$ by cube roots of unity.

Let us briefly describe the structure of the algebra $\mathcal{G}$. The immediate corollary is that any product of four or more generators must vanish. Here is the proof

$$(\theta^A \theta^B \theta^C) \theta^D = j \theta^B (\theta^C \theta^A \theta^D) = j^2 (\theta^B \theta^A \theta^D) \theta^C = \theta^A (\theta^D \theta^B \theta^C) = j \theta^A \theta^B \theta^C \theta^D.$$

Now, as $(1 - j) \neq 0$, one must have $\theta^A \theta^B \theta^C \theta^D = 0$. The dimension of the ternary Grassmann algebra $\mathcal{G}$ is $N(N+1)(N+2)/3 + 1$. Any cube of a generator is equal to zero, i.e., $(\theta^A)^3 = 0$, and the odd permutation of factors in a product of three leads to an independent quantity.

Our algebra admits a natural $\mathbb{Z}_3$ -grading: under multiplication, the grades add up modulo 3; the numbers are grade 0, the generators θ^A are grade 1; the binary products are grade 2 and the ternary products grade 0 again. The dimensions of the subspaces of grade 0, 1 and 2 are, respectively, N for grade 1, N^2 for grade 2 and $(N^3 - N)/3 + 1$ for grade 0.

The lack of symmetry between the grades 1 and 2 (corresponding to the generator j and its square j^2 in the cyclic group $\mathbb{Z}_3$, which are interchangeable, suggests that one should introduce another set of N generators of grade 2, whose squares would be of grade 1, and which should obey the conjugate ternary relations as follows

$$\bar{\theta}^{\bar{A}} \bar{\theta}^{\bar{B}} \bar{\theta}^{\bar{C}} = j^2 \bar{\theta}^{\bar{B}} \bar{\theta}^{\bar{C}} \bar{\theta}^{\bar{A}}.$$

With respect to the ordinary generators θ^A , the conjugate ones should behave like the products of two θ 's, i.e.,

$$(4.2) \quad \theta^A (\theta^B \theta^C) = j (\theta^B \theta^C) \theta^A \rightarrow \theta^A \bar{\theta}^{\bar{B}} = j \bar{\theta}^{\bar{B}} \theta^A$$

and consequently

$$(4.3) \quad \bar{\theta}^{\bar{B}} \theta^A = j^2 \theta^A \bar{\theta}^{\bar{B}}.$$

One may also note that there is an alternative choice for the commutation relation between the ordinary and conjugate generators, that makes the conjugate generators different from the binary products of ordinary generators

$$(4.4) \quad \theta^A \bar{\theta}^{\bar{B}} = -j \bar{\theta}^{\bar{B}} \theta^A \text{ and } \bar{\theta}^{\bar{B}} \theta^A = -j^2 \theta^A \bar{\theta}^{\bar{B}},$$

which are still compatible with the ternary relations introduced above.

This could be interpreted in the following way. We have assumed that the algebra's field is the field of complex numbers, but we can imagine that it is possible to multiply an element of the $\mathbb{Z}_3$ -graded Grassmann algebra by an element of a *binary* Grassmann algebra. We assume that the binary elements commute with the ternary ones, but anticommute as usual with each other. The $\mathbb{Z}_3$ -graded Grassmann elements of a given grade still have no binary commutation relation. Then our new

algebra admits two gradings: the $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -grading and the $\mathbb{Z}_3$ -grading. The elements of $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -grade 0 and $\mathbb{Z}_3$ -grades 1 and 2 obey the rules (4.2) and (4.3) whereas the elements of $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -grade 1 and $\mathbb{Z}_3$ -grades 1 and 2 obey the rules (4.4). If we think that these objects can help in modelling of the quark fields, then a quark variable would be of $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -grade 1 and $\mathbb{Z}_3$ -grade 1, and an antiquark variable of $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -grade 1 and $\mathbb{Z}_3$ -grade 2. Then the products of a quark and an antiquark would have both grades zero, making it a boson. In the same way, the products of three quark or three antiquark fields would be of $\mathbb{Z}_3$ -grade 0 and of $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -grade 1, that is, they would very much look like a fermionic field.

Now, the $\bar{\theta}$'s generate their own Grassmann subalgebra of the same dimension that the one generated by θ 's; besides, we shall have all the mixed products containing both types of generators, but which can be always ordered e.g., with θ^A 's in front and $\bar{\theta}^{\bar{A}}$'s in the rear, by virtue of commutation relations. The products of θ^A 's alone or of $\bar{\theta}^{\bar{A}}$'s alone span two subalgebras of dimension $N(N+1)(N+2)/3$ each; the mixed products span new sectors of the $\mathbb{Z}_3$ -graded Grassmann algebra.

In the case of usual $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -graded Grassmann algebras the anti-commutation between the generators of the algebra and the assumed associativity imply automatically the fact that *all* grade 0 elements *commute* with the rest of the algebra, while *any two* elements of grade 1 anti-commute.

In the case of the $\mathbb{Z}_3$ -graded generalization such an extension of ternary and binary relations *does not follow automatically* and must be explicitly imposed. If we decide to extend the relations (4.2), (4.3) and (4.4) to *all* elements of the algebra having a well-defined grade (i.e., the monomials in θ 's and $\bar{\theta}$'s), then many additional expressions must vanish, e.g.,

$$\theta^A \underbrace{\theta^B \bar{\theta}^{\bar{C}}}_{\text{grade 0}} = \underbrace{\theta^B \bar{\theta}^{\bar{C}}}_{\text{grade 0}} \theta^A = \theta^B \underbrace{\bar{\theta}^{\bar{C}} \theta^A}_{\text{grade 0}} = \bar{\theta}^{\bar{C}} \theta^A \theta^B = 0,$$

because on the one side, $\theta^B \bar{\theta}^{\bar{C}}$ and $\bar{\theta}^{\bar{C}} \theta^A$ are of grade 0 and commute with all other elements, and on the other side, commuting $\bar{\theta}^{\bar{C}}$ with $\theta^A \theta^B$ one gets twice the factor j , which leads to the overall factor $j^2 \bar{\theta}^{\bar{C}} \theta^A \theta^B$. This produces a contradiction which can be solved only by supposing that $\theta^A \theta^B \bar{\theta}^{\bar{C}} = 0$.

The resulting $\mathbb{Z}_3$ -graded algebra contains only the following combinations of generators:

$$A_1 = \{\theta, \bar{\theta}\bar{\theta}\}, A_2 = \{\bar{\theta}, \theta\theta\} \quad \text{and} \quad A_0 = \{\mathbf{1}, \theta\bar{\theta}, \theta\theta\theta, \bar{\theta}\bar{\theta}\bar{\theta}\}.$$

The dimension of the algebra is

$$D(N) = 1 + 2N + 3N^2 + \frac{2(N^3 - N)}{3} = \frac{3 + 4N + 9N^2 + 2N^3}{3}.$$

The four summands 1, $2N$, $3N^2$ and $\frac{2(N^3 - N)}{3}$ correspond to the subspaces respectively spanned by the combinations $\{\mathbb{C}\}$, $\{\theta, \bar{\theta}\}$, $\{\theta\theta, \theta\bar{\theta}, \bar{\theta}\theta\}$ and $\{\theta\theta\theta, \bar{\theta}\bar{\theta}\bar{\theta}\}$.

Let us note that the set of grade 0 (which obviously forms a subalgebra of the $\mathbb{Z}_3$ -graded Grassmann algebra) contains the products which could symbolize the only observable combinations of *quark fields* in quantum chromodynamics based on the $SU(3)$ -symmetry.

We can introduce the $\mathbb{Z}_3$ -graded derivations of the $\mathbb{Z}_3$ -graded Grassmann algebra by postulating the following set of rules:

$$\partial_A(\mathbf{1}) = 0, \quad \partial_A \theta^B = \delta_A^B \quad \text{and} \quad \partial_A \bar{\theta}^{\bar{B}} = 0$$

and similarly

$$\partial_{\bar{A}}(\mathbf{1}) = 0, \quad \partial_{\bar{B}}\bar{\theta}^{\bar{C}} = \delta_{\bar{B}}^{\bar{C}} \quad \text{and} \quad \partial_{\bar{B}}\theta^A = 0.$$

When acting on various binary and ternary products, the derivation rules are the following:

$$\partial_A(\theta^B\theta^C) = \delta_A^B\theta^C + j\delta_A^C\theta^B \quad \text{and} \quad \partial_A(\theta^B\theta^C\theta^D) = \delta_A^B\theta^C\theta^D + j\delta_A^C\theta^D\theta^B + j^2\delta_A^D\theta^B\theta^C.$$

Similarly, for the conjugate entities,

$$\partial_{\bar{A}}(\bar{\theta}^{\bar{B}}\bar{\theta}^{\bar{C}}) = \delta_{\bar{A}}^{\bar{B}}\bar{\theta}^{\bar{C}} + j^2\delta_{\bar{A}}^{\bar{C}}\bar{\theta}^{\bar{B}} \quad \text{and} \quad \partial_{\bar{A}}(\bar{\theta}^{\bar{B}}\bar{\theta}^{\bar{C}}\bar{\theta}^{\bar{D}}) = \delta_{\bar{A}}^{\bar{B}}\bar{\theta}^{\bar{C}}\bar{\theta}^{\bar{D}} + j^2\delta_{\bar{A}}^{\bar{C}}\bar{\theta}^{\bar{D}}\bar{\theta}^{\bar{B}} + j\delta_{\bar{A}}^{\bar{D}}\bar{\theta}^{\bar{B}}\bar{\theta}^{\bar{C}}.$$

We emphasize the "twisted" Leibniz rule for the ternary products in the above formulae.

Finally, for mixed binary products like $\theta^A\bar{\theta}^{\bar{B}}$, the derivation rules are the following:

$$\partial_A(\theta^B\bar{\theta}^{\bar{C}}) = \delta_A^B\bar{\theta}^{\bar{C}} \quad \text{and} \quad \partial_{\bar{A}}(\theta^B\bar{\theta}^{\bar{C}}) = j\delta_{\bar{A}}^{\bar{C}}\theta^B.$$

There is no need for rules of derivation of fourth-order homogeneous expressions, because these vanish identically.

As the immediate consequence of these rules, we have the following important identities:

$$\partial_A\partial_B\partial_C = j\partial_B\partial_C\partial_A \quad \text{and} \quad \partial_{\bar{A}}\partial_{\bar{B}}\partial_{\bar{C}} = j^2\partial_{\bar{B}}\partial_{\bar{C}}\partial_{\bar{A}},$$

while

$$\partial_A\partial_{\bar{C}} = j\partial_{\bar{C}}\partial_A \quad \text{and} \quad \partial_{\bar{C}}\partial_A = j^2\partial_A\partial_{\bar{C}}.$$

Hence we have the important consequence

$$(4.5) \quad \partial_A\partial_B\partial_C + \partial_B\partial_C\partial_A + \partial_C\partial_A\partial_B = 0.$$

The $\mathbb{Z}_3$ -graded generalization of the Grassmanian and the $\mathbb{Z}_3$ -graded derivatives defined above can be used in order to produce a $\mathbb{Z}_3$ -generalization of the supersymmetry generators acting on the usual $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -graded Grassmann algebra generated by anticommuting fermionic variables θ^α and $\bar{\theta}^{\dot{\beta}}$ satisfying the relations

$$\theta^\alpha\theta^\beta + \theta^\beta\theta^\alpha = 0, \quad \bar{\theta}^{\dot{\alpha}}\theta^\beta + \theta^\beta\bar{\theta}^{\dot{\alpha}} = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{\theta}^{\dot{\alpha}}\bar{\theta}^{\dot{\beta}} + \bar{\theta}^{\dot{\beta}}\bar{\theta}^{\dot{\alpha}} = 0.$$

The "anti-Leibniz" rule of derivation

$$\partial_\alpha(\theta^\beta\theta^\gamma) = \delta_\alpha^\beta\theta^\gamma - \delta_\alpha^\gamma\theta^\beta$$

and similarly for any two dotted indices or mixed indices, one verifies easily that all such derivations do anticommute:

$$\partial_\alpha\partial_\beta + \partial_\beta\partial_\alpha = 0, \quad \partial_{\dot{\alpha}}\partial_{\dot{\beta}} + \partial_{\dot{\beta}}\partial_{\dot{\alpha}} = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \partial_\alpha\partial_{\dot{\beta}} + \partial_{\dot{\beta}}\partial_\alpha = 0.$$

These rules enable us to construct the generators of the supersymmetric (or $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -graded) "odd" translations

$$\mathcal{D}_\alpha = \partial_\alpha + \sigma_{\alpha\dot{\beta}}^k \bar{\theta}^{\dot{\beta}} \partial_k \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{D}_{\dot{\beta}} = \partial_{\dot{\beta}} + \sigma_{\alpha\dot{\beta}}^m \theta^\alpha \partial_m,$$

where both dotted and un-dotted indices $\alpha, \dot{\beta}$ take the values 1 and 2, while the space-time indices k, l and m run from 0 to 3. The anti-commutators of these differential operators yield the ordinary ("even") space-time translations

$$\mathcal{D}_\alpha\mathcal{D}_{\dot{\beta}} + \mathcal{D}_{\dot{\beta}}\mathcal{D}_\alpha = 2\sigma_{\alpha\dot{\beta}}^k \partial_k,$$

while

$$\mathcal{D}_\alpha\mathcal{D}_\beta + \mathcal{D}_\beta\mathcal{D}_\alpha = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{D}_{\dot{\alpha}}\mathcal{D}_{\dot{\beta}} + \mathcal{D}_{\dot{\beta}}\mathcal{D}_{\dot{\alpha}} = 0.$$

The $\mathbb{Z}_3$ -graded generalization would amount to find a "cubic root" of a linear differential operator, making use of equation (4.5). We must have six kinds of generalized

Grassmann variables θ^A , $\hat{\theta}^{\hat{A}}$ and $\check{\theta}^{\check{A}}$ on the one hand and $\bar{\theta}^{\bar{A}}$, $\bar{\hat{\theta}}^{\bar{\hat{A}}}$ and $\bar{\check{\theta}}^{\bar{\check{A}}}$ on the other hand, which is formally analogous to the $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -graded case. Instead of the Pauli matrices we should introduce the entities endowed with three indices (“cubic matrices”) with which the generators of the $\mathbb{Z}_3$ -graded translations of grade 1 and 2 may be constructed as follows:

$$D_A = \partial_A + \rho_{\hat{A}\hat{B}\check{C}}^m \hat{\theta}^{\hat{B}} \check{\theta}^{\check{C}} \nabla_m + \omega_{A\bar{A}}^m \bar{\theta}^{\bar{A}} \nabla_m, \quad D_{\bar{A}} = \partial_{\bar{A}} + \bar{\rho}_{\bar{A}\bar{\hat{B}}\bar{\check{C}}}^m \bar{\hat{\theta}}^{\bar{\hat{B}}} \bar{\check{\theta}}^{\bar{\check{C}}} \nabla_m + \bar{\omega}_{\bar{A}\bar{A}}^m \theta^{\bar{A}} \nabla_m,$$

$$D_{\hat{B}} = \partial_{\hat{B}} + \rho_{\hat{A}\hat{B}\check{C}}^m \theta^{\hat{A}} \check{\theta}^{\check{C}} \nabla_m + \omega_{\hat{B}\bar{\hat{B}}}^m \bar{\hat{\theta}}^{\bar{\hat{B}}} \nabla_m, \quad D_{\bar{\hat{B}}} = \partial_{\bar{\hat{B}}} + \bar{\rho}_{\bar{\hat{A}}\bar{\hat{B}}\bar{\check{C}}}^m \bar{\theta}^{\bar{\hat{A}}} \bar{\check{\theta}}^{\bar{\check{C}}} \nabla_m + \bar{\omega}_{\bar{\hat{B}}\bar{\hat{B}}}^m \theta^{\bar{\hat{B}}} \nabla_m$$

and

$$D_{\check{C}} = \partial_{\check{C}} + \rho_{\hat{A}\hat{B}\check{C}}^m \theta^{\hat{A}} \hat{\theta}^{\hat{B}} \nabla_m + \omega_{\check{C}\bar{\check{C}}}^m \bar{\check{\theta}}^{\bar{\check{C}}} \nabla_m, \quad D_{\bar{\check{C}}} = \partial_{\bar{\check{C}}} + \bar{\rho}_{\bar{\hat{A}}\bar{\hat{B}}\bar{\check{C}}}^m \bar{\theta}^{\bar{\hat{A}}} \bar{\hat{\theta}}^{\bar{\hat{B}}} \nabla_m + \bar{\omega}_{\bar{\check{C}}\bar{\check{C}}}^m \check{\theta}^{\bar{\check{C}}} \nabla_m.$$

The nature of the indices needs not to be specified; the only important thing to be assumed at this stage is that the differential operators ∇_m do commute with the $\mathbb{Z}_3$ -graded differentiations ∂_A . It is also interesting to consider the operators one gets when the ∇_m are replaced with *supersymmetric* derivations (that anticommute with the $\mathbb{Z}_3$ -graded differentiations). But in the simpler case described here, the following operators acting on the $\mathbb{Z}_3$ -graded generalized Grassmannian:

$$D_{\hat{A}\hat{B}\check{C}}^{III} = D_A D_B D_C + D_B D_C D_A + D_C D_A D_B + D_C D_B D_A + D_B D_A D_C + D_A D_C D_B,$$

$$\bar{D}_{\bar{\hat{A}}\bar{\hat{B}}\bar{\check{C}}}^{III} = D_{\bar{A}} D_{\bar{B}} D_{\bar{C}} + D_{\bar{B}} D_{\bar{C}} D_{\bar{A}} + D_{\bar{C}} D_{\bar{A}} D_{\bar{B}} + D_{\bar{C}} D_{\bar{B}} D_{\bar{A}} + D_{\bar{B}} D_{\bar{A}} D_{\bar{C}} + D_{\bar{A}} D_{\bar{C}} D_{\bar{B}}$$

and

$$D_{A\bar{A}}^{II} = D_A D_{\bar{A}} - j^2 D_{\bar{A}} D_A$$

represent *homogeneous* operators on the $\mathbb{Z}_3$ -graded Grassmann algebra, i.e., they map polynomials in θ 's of a given grade into polynomials of the same grade; the result can be represented by a complex-valued matrix containing various combinations of the differentiations ∇_m ; their eventual symmetry properties will depend on the assumed symmetry properties of the matrices ρ_{ABC} and $\omega_{A\bar{B}}$.

Let us consider in more detail the case of dimension 3 (the simplest possible realization of the $\mathbb{Z}_3$ -graded Grassmannian and the derivations on it is of course the case with *one* generator and its conjugate).

The dimension of the $\mathbb{Z}_3$ -graded Grassmann algebra with three grade-1 generators θ , $\hat{\theta}$ and $\check{\theta}$ and three “conjugate” grade-2 generators $\bar{\theta}$, $\bar{\hat{\theta}}$ and $\bar{\check{\theta}}$ is 51; any linear operator, including the derivations ∂_A and the multiplication by any combination of the generators, as well as the operators D_A and $D_{\bar{A}}$ introduced above, can be represented by means of 51×51 complex-valued matrices. Unfortunately, the operators D^{II} and D^{III} are neither diagonal nor diagonalizable. But if we apply them to a scalar function f , we get

$$D_{\hat{1}\hat{1}}^{II} f = (\omega_{\hat{1}\hat{1}}^m + \bar{\omega}_{\hat{1}\hat{1}}^m) \nabla_m f$$

and

$$D_{\hat{1}\hat{1}\hat{1}}^{III} f = -3j^2 \rho_{\hat{1}\hat{1}\hat{1}}^m \nabla_m f \text{ as well as } \bar{D}_{\bar{\hat{1}}\bar{\hat{1}}\bar{\hat{1}}}^{III} f = -3j \bar{\rho}_{\bar{\hat{1}}\bar{\hat{1}}\bar{\hat{1}}}^m \nabla_m f.$$

The ω matrices are the only ones that remain in the D^{II} whereas the ρ cubic matrices emerge from the ternary combinations D^{III} . On the space of scalar functions, our operators act simultaneously as *square* and *cubic* roots of ordinary translations. Using extensions of these objects, where ∇_m are replaced with the supersymmetry generators, we have constructed a simple $\mathbb{Z}_3$ -graded noncommutative geometry model featuring three Higgs fields. The lagrangian contains the potential term

$$V = 3 |\Phi_1 + \Phi_2 + \Phi_3 + \Phi_1 \Phi_2 + \Phi_2 \Phi_3 + \Phi_3 \Phi_1 + \Phi_1 \Phi_2 \Phi_3|^2$$

and implies multiple spontaneous symmetry breaking.

The ternary generalization of Grassmann algebra described in this section can be used to construct a generalization of exterior calculus with exterior differential d satisfying $d^N = 0$ with $N > 2$. This direction of research has been developed by Abramov's post-graduate student N. Bazunova (b. 1964) in [2].

Acknowledgments

I am grateful to the organizers of the Estonian-Finnish Seminar on the Development of Mathematics for an invitation to give a talk on the development of differential geometry in Estonia. I would like to express my gratitude to Ü. Lumiste who took the trouble to read the manuscript of this paper and his suggestions have been very valuable for me in preparation of the final version of this paper. I am also grateful to my colleagues M. Rahula, A. Parring, L. Tuulmets, K. Riives, E. Abel, H. Kilp for the valuable explanations concerning their research and the biographic materials, which they kindly placed at my disposal. I gratefully acknowledge the financial support of the Estonian Science Foundation under the grant No. 4515.

REFERENCES

1. E. Abel, *The connections of a surfaces of incomplete rank in a non-Euclidean space* (Russian), Tartu Riikl. ÜL. Toimetised **431** (1977), 68–81.
2. V. Abramov, N. Bazuniva, *Exterior calculus with $d^3 = 0$ on a free associative algebra and reduced quantum plane*. New symmetries and integrable models (Karpacz, 1999), 3–7, World Sci. Publishing, River Edge, NJ, 2000.
3. V. Abramov, Ü. Lumiste, *Superspace with underlying Banach bundle of connections and supersymmetry of effective action* (Russian), Izv. Vyssh. Uchebn. Zaved., Mat. (1986), no. 1, 3–12.
4. V. Abramov, R. Kerner, B. Le Roy, *Hypersymmetry: A $\mathbb{Z}_3$ -generalization of supersymmetry*, J. Math. Phys., **38** (1997), no. 3, 1650–1669.
5. V. Abramov, M. Rahula, K. Riives (ed.), *Ülo Lumiste mathematician. Biobibliography of Ülo Lumiste. Development of differential geometry in Estonia*. Estonian Mathematical Society, Tartu, 1999.
6. A. Fleischer, *Algebras of metric connections on homogeneous spaces*, Proceedings of the 3rd Congress of Geometry (Thessaloniki, 1991), 152–158, Aristotle Univ. Thessaloniku, Thessaloniku, 1992.
7. A. Fleischer, *Triple systems and submanifolds in a homogeneous space*, Tartu Riikl. ÜL. Toimetised **899** (1990), 111–120.
8. H. Kilp, *Geometry of systems of first-order quasi-linear system of partial differential equations with two independent variables and different characteristics* (Russian), Tartu Riikl. ÜL. Toimetised **464**, (1978), 146–155.
9. H. Kilp, *Quasi-linear systems of type S_{42}^1 with different characteristics for two-dimensional surface in R_4 with zero Gaussian curvature and torsion (geometric theory)* (Russian), Tartu Riikl. ÜL. Toimetised **355** (1975), 127–137.
10. R. Kolde, *Congruences of null straight lines in space $R^{1,3}$ and their canonical frames* (Russian), Tartu Riikl. ÜL. Toimetised **253** (1970), 73–95.
11. Ü. Lumiste, *Differential geometry of lined surfaces V_3 in $\mathbf{R}_4$* , Mat. Sb. (N.S.) **50** (92) (1960), 203–220.
12. Ü. Lumiste, *On the theory of two-dimensional minimal surfaces. II. Surfaces of constant curvature* (Russian), Tartu Riikl. ÜL. Toimetised **102** (1961), 16–28.
13. Ü. Lumiste, *On the theory of two-dimensional minimal surfaces. III. The fundamental theorem and bending* (Russian), Tartu Riikl. ÜL. Toimetised **129** (1962), 74–89.
14. Ü. Lumiste, *On the theory of two-dimensional minimal surfaces. IV. Surfaces with circles of curvature* (Russian), Tartu Riikl. ÜL. Toimetised **129** (1962), 90–102.

15. Ü. Lumiste, *Connections in homogeneous fiber bundles*, Amer. Math. Soc. Transl. II **92** (1970), 231–174.
16. Ü. Lumiste, *On the theory of manifolds of planes in Euclidean space* (Russian), Tartu Riikl. ÜI. Toimetised **192** (1966), 12–46.
17. Ü. Lumiste, *Connections in geometric interpretation of the Yang-Mills and the Faddeev-Popov fields* (Russian), Izv. Vyssh. Uchebn. Zaved. Mat. 1983, no. 1, 46–54.
18. Ü. Lumiste, *Semi-symmetric submanifolds with maximal first normal space*, Eesti NSV Tead. Akad. Toimetised Füüs.-Mat. **38**, no. 4 (1989), 453–457.
19. Ü. Lumiste, *Classification of three-dimensional semi-symmetric submanifolds in Euclidean spaces*, Tartu Riikl. ÜI. Toimetised **899** (1990), 29–44.
20. Ü. Lumiste, *Second order envelopes of symmetric Segre submanifolds*, Tartu Riikl. ÜI. Toimetised **930** (1991), 15–26.
21. Ü. Lumiste, *Semi-symmetric submanifolds and modified Nomizu problem*, Proceedings of the 3rd Congress of Geometry (Thessaloniki 1991), 263–274, Aristotle Univ. Thessaloniki, Thessaloniki, 1992.
22. Ü. Lumiste, *Martin Bartels as researcher: his contribution to analytical methods in geometry*, Historia Math. **24** (1997), no. 1, 46–65.
23. Ü. Lumiste, *Submanifolds with parallel fundamental form. Handbook on Differential Geometry*, **1**, 779–864, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 2000.
24. Ü. Lumiste, *Semiparallel submanifolds in space forms* (in preparation).
25. Ü. Lumiste, K. Riives, *Three-dimensional semi-symmetric submanifolds with axial, planar or spatial points in Euclidean spaces*, Tartu Riikl. ÜI. Toimetised **899** (1990), 13–8.
26. Ü. Lumiste, M. Väljas, *Totally quasiumbilical submanifolds with nonflat normal connection*, Eesti NSV Tead. Akad. Toimetised Füüs.-Mat. **37** (1988), no. 4, 437–440.
27. I. Maasikas, *On the Riemannian geometry of Grassmann manifolds of nonisotropic subspaces of a pseudoeuclidean space* (Russian), Tartu Riikl. ÜI. Toimetised **342** (1974), 76–82.
28. R. Mullari, *On the principle directions of an m -dimensional surface* (Russian), Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR **144** (1962), 989–992.
29. R. Mullari, *Maximally symmetric surfaces of a higher-dimensional Euclidean space* (Russian), Tartu Riikl. ÜI. Toimetised **129** (1962), 63–73.
30. A. Parring, *Families of symplectic plains in an affine-symplectic space* (Russian), Tartu Riikl. ÜI. Toimetised **305** (1972), 21–45.
31. E. Phillips, *Karl M. Peterson: the earliest derivation of the Mainardi-Codazzi equations and the fundamental theorem of surface theory*, Historia Math. **6** (1979), no. 2, 137–163.
32. M. Rahula, *New problems in differential geometry*, World Scientific Publishing Co., Inc., River Edge, NJ, 1993.
33. M. Rahula, *Vector fields and symmetries*, Univ. of Tartu Press, Tartu, 2004.
34. K. Riives, *On a function of reducibility of a class of four-dimensional semiparallel submanifolds*, Proc. Estonian Acad. Sci. Phys. Math. **49** (2000), no. 1, 3–11.
35. K. Riives, *On the special class of curves on some four-dimensional semiparallel submanifolds. Differential geometry and applications* (Brno, 1998) 215–222, Masaryk Univ., Brno, 1999.
36. J. Thierry-Mieg, *Geometrical reinterpretation of Faddeev-Popov ghost particles and BRS transformations*, J. Math. Phys. **21** (1980), no. 12, 2834–2838.
37. J. Thierry-Mieg, *Explicit classical construction of the Faddeev-Popov ghost field*, Nuovo Cimento A(11) **56** (1980), no. 4, 396–404.
38. L. Tuulmets, *The bending of minimal congruence V_3 in R_4* , Eesti NSV Tead. Akad. Toimetised. Füüs.-Mat. Tehn.-tead. **13** (1964), no. 4, 210–216.
39. T. Virovere, *Evolutes of higher order for a submanifold M^m in E^n* , Eesti NSV Tead. Akad. Toimetised Füüs.-Mat. **40** (1991), no. 2, 65–74.
40. M. Väljas, *Dupin-Mannheim submanifolds and Clifford cones in E_{n+m}* (Russian), Tartu Riikl. ÜI. Toimetised **803** (1988), 41–51.
41. C.N. Yang and R.L. Mills, *Conservation of isotopic spin and isotopic gauge invariance*, Physical Rev. (2) **96** (1954), 191–195.